

1 order that was to accompany Defendants' Opposition had been inadvertently omitted from the
 2 filing. Additionally, due to technical difficulties, undersigned counsel was not able to create the
 3 table of contents and table of authorities for Defendants' Opposition prior to the filing of that
 4 submission on Friday, March 1, 2019. Accordingly, Defendants respectfully submit herewith the
 5 proposed order, table of contents, and table of authorities for the Defendants' Opposition. *See*
 6 Appendix 1. Defendants apologize for any inconvenience that the absence of these materials
 7 caused to the Court or to Plaintiff.

8
 9 Dated: March 5, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

10
 11 JOSEPH H. HUNT
 12 Assistant Attorney General

13 DAVID L. ANDERSON
 14 United States Attorney

15 ANTHONY J. COPPOLINO
 16 Deputy Branch Director

17 /s/ Julia A. Heiman
 18 JULIA A. HEIMAN, Bar No. 241415
 19 Senior Counsel
 20 CHRISTOPHER HEALY
 21 Trial Attorney
 22 U.S. Department of Justice
 23 Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch
 24 P.O. Box 883
 25 Washington, D.C. 20044
 26 julia.heiman@usdoj.gov
 27 *Attorneys for Defendants*
 28

Appendix 1

JOSEPH H. HUNT
Assistant Attorney General
DAVID L. ANDERSON
United States Attorney
ANTHONY J. COPPOLINO
Deputy Branch Director
JULIA A. HEIMAN
Senior Counsel
CHRISTOPHER HEALY
Trial Attorney
United States Department of Justice
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch

P.O. Box 883
Washington, D.C. 20044
Telephone: (202) 514-8095
Facsimile: (202) 616-8470
Email: Christopher.Healy@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Defendants the Attorney General, *et al.*

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

_____)	
TWITTER, INC.,)	Case No. 14-cv-4480
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
)	
v.)	
)	
WILLIAM P. BARR, United States)	
Attorney General, <i>et al.</i> ,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	[PROPOSED] ORDER

1 The Court, having considered the Plaintiff's Motion Challenging Defendants'
2 Designations, the Defendants' opposition thereto, and any reply submitted in support thereof,
3 hereby **ORDERS** that the Plaintiff's Motion is **DENIED**.

4
5 IT IS SO **ORDERED**, this _____ day of _____, 2019.

6
7
8 Dated: _____

9 _____
10 HON. YVONNE GONZALEZ ROGERS
11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
BACKGROUND.....	2
ARGUMENT	3
I. The Deliberative Process Privilege Has Been Validly Asserted with Respect to the Documents.....	3
II. The Government’s Decision-making Process and Mental Impressions are not “At Issue,” so Plaintiff Does not Have a Need for Deliberative Information.....	7
III. The Documents are Validly Protected by the Attorney-Client Privilege and Work Product Doctrine.....	9
CONCLUSION	13

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Access Reports v. Dep't of Justice</i> , 926 F.2d 1192 (D.C. Cir. 1991)	4
<i>Assembly of State of Cal. v. U.S. Dep't of Commerce</i> , 968 F.2d 916 (9th Cir. 1992)	4, 7
<i>Carl Zeiss Stiftung v. V.E.B. Carl Zeiss, Jena</i> , 540 F.R.D. 318 (D.D.C. 1966)	3
<i>Carter v. Dep't of Commerce</i> , 307 F.3d 1084 (9th Cir. 2002)	5
<i>Dep't of Interior v. Klamath Water Users Protective Ass'n</i> , 532 U.S. 1 (2001)	3
<i>Elec. Frontier Found. v. Dep't of Justice</i> , 2016 WL 7406429 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 22, 2016)	10
<i>Hickman v. Taylor</i> , 329 U.S. 495 (1947)	11
<i>Hinckley v. United States</i> , 140 F.3d 277 (D.C. Cir. 1998)	4
<i>Holmes v. Hernandez</i> , 700 F. Supp. 2d 1182 (N.D. Cal. 2009)	7
<i>In re Cal. Pub. Utils. Comm'n</i> , 892 F.2d 778 (9th Cir. 1989)	11
<i>In re City of Erie</i> , 473 F.3d 413 (2d Cir. 2007)	9
<i>In re Grand Jury Investigation</i> , 974 F.2d 1068 (9th Cir. 1992)	9
<i>In re Grand Jury Subpoena, Mark Torf/Torf Envtl. Mgmt. (Torf)</i> , 357 F.3d 900 (9th Cir. 2004)	12
<i>In re Nat'l Sec. Letter</i> , 863 F.3d 1110 (9th Cir. 2017)	7, 8
<i>In re Sealed Case</i> , 121 F.3d 729 (D.C. Cir. 1997)	3

1	<i>Karnoski v. Trump</i> ,	
2	2018 WL 1784464 (W.D. Wash Apr. 13, 2018)	8, 9
3	<i>Landry v. FDIC</i> ,	
4	204 F.3d 1125 (D.C. Cir. 2000)	4
5	<i>Maricopa Audubon Soc. v. U.S. Forest Serv.</i> ,	
6	108 F.3d 1089 (9th Cir. 1997)	3-4
7	<i>NLRB v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.</i> ,	
8	421 U.S. 132 (1975)	3, 4
9	<i>Renegotiation Bd. v. Grumman Aircraft Eng'g Corp.</i> ,	
10	421 U.S. 168 (1975)	3
11	<i>Riverkeeper v U.S. Army Corps of Eng'rs</i> ,	
12	38 F. Supp. 3d 1207 (D. Or. 2014)	10
13	<i>Tax Analysts v. IRS</i> ,	
14	117 F. 3d 607 (D.C. Cir. 1997)	5, 6
15	<i>United States v. Christensen</i> ,	
16	828 F.3d 763 (9th Cir. 2015)	9
17	<i>United States v. Martin</i> ,	
18	278 F.3d 988 (9th Cir. 2002)	10
19	<i>United States v. Nixon</i> ,	
20	418 U.S. 683 (1974)	3
21	<i>Wiener v. FBI</i> ,	
22	943 F.2d 972 (9th Cir. 1991)	10
23	<i>Upjohn Co. v. United States</i> ,	
24	449 U.S. 383 (1953)	9
25	Executive Orders	
26	Exec. Order No. 13526, 75 Fed. Reg. 707 (Dec. 29, 2009)	7